

Remarks/Arguments:

This Amendment adds no new claims, and amends claims 1, 5, 6, 7 and 8. No new matter has been added. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-8 will be pending.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner has objected to the specification as having typographical errors at page 6, line 12, and at page 7, line 31. Accordingly, the Applicant has amended the specification to correct the errors as noted by the Examiner. The Applicant has further amended the specification at page 1, line 26 to correct a typographical error.

Rejections of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003-0044000 A1 issued to Kfoury et al. (hereinafter referred to as Kfoury).

Regarding claims 1, 7 and 8, the Examiner points to Figs. 1-4 of Kfoury as disclosing a direction detecting section (sensors) for detecting an orientation (of a manually rotatable keypad), a display controller for orienting and outputting a display based upon the sensor outputs, and a display section for displaying the oriented data, and therefore purportedly teaching the invention claimed by the Applicant in independent claims 1, 7 and 8.

However, the Kfoury reference discloses a rotatable keypad which can include one or more sensors for detecting a *keypad orientation*. The detected keypad orientation is then used to orient a display of data. The sensors include switches, LED/photoelectronics, and reed switches. However, the Applicant claims a device and method which detect a direction in which the mobile terminal is placed. By contrast, the disclosed keypad orientation sensors of the Kfoury reference cannot be

used to detect a direction in which the mobile terminal itself is placed, but rather can only detect an orientation of the keypad.

Further, the Examiner states that simply displaying a view in landscape versus portrait teaches the generation and display of full size data when in the 90° position and the 270° position, and therefore purportedly teaches the invention claimed by the Applicant in independent claim 8. However, the Kfoury reference discloses in Figs. 1-4 simple rotation of "TEXT" in a substantially square display between a portrait and landscape position, which of itself, does not alter a size. There is no disclosure or reasonable suggestion in the Kfoury reference of an adjustment to a size of the displayed data. The Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 7 and 8 to more closely claim a device and method in which the detection of the device direction is used to determine a display size, among other claimed operations. This is not new matter and is disclosed at several places in the specification (see page 11, lines 29-31, and page 12, lines 1-8).

Accordingly, the Kfoury reference does not teach nor reasonably suggest each element of amended independent claims 1, 7 and 8.

Regarding claims 3 and 4, the Examiner points to Fig. 6 of Kfoury as disclosing a direction detecting section (sensors) in a folder housing or a main housing of a device, and therefore purportedly teaching the invention claimed by the Applicant in dependent claims 3 and 4. However, claims 3 and 4 depend from independent claim 1. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, the Applicant asserts that the Kfoury reference does not teach nor reasonably suggest each element of amended independent claim 1, and dependent claims 3 and 4.

Rejections of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kfoury in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002-0033836 A1 to

Smith (hereinafter referred to as Smith), and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001-0007469 A1 to Fuchimukai et al. (hereinafter referred to as Fuchimukai).

Regarding claim 2, the Examiner points to Kfoury as disclosing a direction detecting section (sensors) and points to Smith as disclosing sensor or switch using a movable magnet and Hall effect sensors. The Examiner further points to Fig. 4 of Fuchimukai as disclosing a guide chamber with four extended portions, and therefore purportedly teaching the invention claimed by the Applicant in dependent claim 2. However, claim 2 depends from amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, the Applicant asserts that the Kfoury, Smith and Fuchimukai references do not teach nor reasonably suggest individually or in combination each element of amended independent claim 1, and dependent claim 2.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kfoury in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,612,732 to Yuyama et al. (hereinafter referred to as Yuyama). Yuyama is merely relied on to teach a mobile device having a camera module or a tuner.

However, the Applicant has amended independent claims 5 and 6 to more closely claim a device and method in which the detection of the device direction is used to determine a display size. This is not new matter and is disclosed at several places in the specification (see page 11, lines 29-31, and page 12, lines 1-8).

Accordingly, the Kfoury and Yuyama references do not teach nor reasonably suggest individually or in combination each element of amended independent claims 5 and 6.

Application No. 10/765,062
Amendment dated January 18, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005

Conclusion

In view of the above, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald S. Grubb
Ronald S. Grubb
Reg. No. 48,672
Attorney for Applicant

Dated: January 18, 2006
Roylance, Abrams, Bordo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
T: (202) 659-9076